



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

years had elapsed. *Gunton v. Carroll*, 101 U. S. 426. Such a decree would be justifiable because the court would have before it all the facts which might render performance equitable or inequitable. In the present case, however, the court by its decree has bound both parties to carry out the contract at some indefinite future time. See LANGDELL, BRIEF SUR. EQ. JURISD., 46. Pending that time circumstances may intervene which would render performance an injustice to one or to both parties. See *Gotthelf v. Stranahan*, 138 N. Y. 345. From the nature of the case the court could not have these circumstances in mind. Consequently the principal case seems right in holding that the court cannot "suspend" a decree of specific performance over the parties.

TAXATION — PROPERTY SUBJECT TO TAXATION — PROCEEDS OF FEDERAL SALARY. — The defendant taxed the plaintiff's bank deposit, which consisted only of money received by the plaintiff as his salary as an officer in the United States Navy. *Held*, that the tax is constitutional. *Dyer v. City of Melrose*, 83 N. E. 6 (Mass.).

A state cannot impose an income tax on the interest on federal bonds. *Weston v. Charleston*, 2 Pet. (U. S.) 449. But it can tax as personal property checks drawn on a sub-treasury for the payment of interest on the same bonds. *Savings Society v. San Francisco*, 200 U. S. 310. It cannot tax land owned by the federal government, though not used for any public purpose. *Van Brocklin v. Tennessee*, 117 U. S. 151. But as soon as an individual has taken the necessary steps to acquire the land, he may be taxed thereon, though, until the patent is issued, the legal title remains in the United States. *Witherspoon v. Duncan*, 4 Wall. (U. S.) 210. The test given is whether the state taxation impairs the efficiency of a federal agency in performing its functions. See *Railroad Co. v. Penniston*, 18 Wall. (U. S.) 5. Applying this test, the decision in the present case seems correct. The state could not, it is true, have taxed the salary of the plaintiff as income. *Dobbins v. Commissioners of Erie County*, 16 Pet. (U. S.) 435. But a tax on the money after it has been paid to him in no sense lessens the remuneration of a federal agent. The money has lost all federal nature, and has become indistinguishable from any other personal property taxable by the state.

TAXATION — PROPERTY SUBJECT TO TAXATION — STATE TAX ON PROCEEDS OF SALE OF IMPORTS. — A foreign corporation was engaged in New York in the business of importing and selling goods in the original package. The proceeds of the sales, when in the form of cash, were temporarily deposited in New York banks, and when in the form of bills were held in New York for collection. The balance of the proceeds, after paying the customs duties on imports and other business expenses, were immediately remitted abroad. A tax was levied by the state on the cash on hand and in bank and on bills receivable, as capital employed by the corporation in business within the state. *Held*, that the tax was not invalid as a regulation of foreign commerce. *People v. Wells*, U. S. Sup. Ct., Jan. 6, 1908. See NOTES, p. 353.

TRADE-MARKS AND TRADE-NAMES — PROTECTION APART FROM STATUTE — SITUS OF PROPERTY RIGHT. — The plaintiffs had manufactured a liqueur which they sold under the trade-name "Chartreuse." This product was made in France, but was sold extensively in this country. The French government confiscated the property, and this trade-name was transferred to the defendant. The plaintiffs removed to another country and, continuing the sale of their goods in this country, marked as before, sought to restrain the defendants from selling their product in this country under the same name. *Held*, that the defendant be enjoined. *Baglin v. Cusenier Co.*, 156 Fed. 1016 (Circ. Ct., N. D. N. Y.). See NOTES, p. 361.